

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Applicant has amended the claims to overcome rejections relating to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has also, to simplify matters, limited claims to articulator trays that have pins inserted therein, since that is the model which has proven useful commercially.

Claims 4 and 11 have been canceled.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Callne. The rejection is traversed. Callne nowhere the invention now claimed wherein pins are inserted into the openings.

Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 (now replaced by claim 21) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Cho (5,622,497). The rejection is traversed. Claim 7, 8 and 15 now require that the trays have pins inserted into the spaces. The reference nowhere suggests such inserts. It is not seen in any reference that a continuous opening be used with pins. The opening makes it possible to have a wide choice in spacing of pins which is not suggested by any of the references. Hence, the claimed invention can not be deemed anticipated.

As to claim 21, the rejection is also traversed. The invention of Cho does not have two arms on the articulator tray, but one insert in the articulator which has two arms. The mechanism of Cho requires extra assembly, which is not required by the instant invention. Hence, the invention claimed is not anticipated by Cho.

Claim 18 (claim 3 has been canceled) has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho. The rejection is traversed. No reference suggested by the Examiner has suggested in any way that pins should be placed in a continuous opening, and no reference is

provided relating to such suggestion. It is urged that, should the Examiner continue to maintain the rejection that an examiner's affidavit be provided as to the expertise of the Examiner in relation to dental laboratory practice

Claims 10, 11 and 17 have been canceled without, however, abandoning the invention claimed therein. However, for the purpose of this application, the rejection over Cho in view of Zeiser is deemed moot.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenna Hendricks, Reg. No. 32,535